

being distributed in ways (chiefly through multilateral agencies like the World Bank and IDB) that encourage other developed nations to carry an increasing share of the aid burden.

Most important of all it reaffirms the commitment of the U.S. Government to meet its responsibilities as the leader of the free world in defending freedom against the ever present threat of totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. TOWER obtained the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MATZOTH SITUATION IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just received a report from the Department of State regarding the results of an on-the-spot investigation of the matzoth situation in the Soviet Union. Most regrettably, officials of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow find conflict and controversy in the stories emanating from Soviet sources. It is further proof of Soviet efforts to conceal the truth and to pretend that matzoth is available when, in fact, that is not the case. Altogether the situation is certainly not encouraging.

I must, however, most strongly dissent from the conclusions of the Department of State that:

Since this question concerns Soviet domestic policies, there does not appear to be any useful action which the Department could take to remedy this situation.

The Department did not take a similar view in urging approval of the wheat deal to relieve domestic food problems, and we will never halt the attacks on religious freedom in the Soviet Union by a head-in-the-sand attitude.

The United States is a member of the United Nations, and the United Nations Charter clearly states:

The United Nations shall promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

It is evident from the facts that the Soviets are conducting a campaign of harassment and intimidation of members of the Jewish faith, and that if pressure is not promptly brought to bear, there will not be an adequate supply of matzoth for observance of the Passover. I strongly urge a direct appeal by our Government to the rulers of the Soviet Union, and increased efforts through the U.N. to alleviate the present policies of discrimination and deprivation which face the Jewish people of the Soviet Union at every turn.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the report from the Department of State, dated March 17, 1964.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1964.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: On March 10, 1964, the Department advised you that the American Embassy at Moscow had been asked to ascertain the present attitude of the Soviet authorities toward furnishing matzoth to Soviet Jews for the Passover season.

The embassy has now informed the Department that conflicting stories have emanated from Soviet sources about the availability of matzoth. The Soviet press agency, Novosti, in the latter part of February issued a release stating "special premises" had been made available for baking matzoth. This information was confirmed by a representative of the Moscow synagogue who simply stated that some sort of premises were available. The Chief Rabbi of Moscow informed New York Times and New York Herald Tribune correspondents on March 1 that his congregation had a building for baking matzoth but that it was in need of repair.

It is understood that Moscow Jews doubt whether sufficient matzoth could be produced in the indicated building to take care of the forthcoming Passover season. There seems to be some question about the availability of flour. Most importantly, it is understood that no matzoth have been prepared at the premises up to the present time.

The embassy further informed the Department that it understands that Soviet Jews will not be permitted to have matzoth baked in State bakeries as in some previous years. The Soviet authorities are said to be permitting Soviet Jews to receive matzoth from abroad but it is doubtful whether these shipments will satisfy the needs of Jews in Moscow and other Soviet cities.

The Department realizes that this information will not be very encouraging to Americans who are concerned about the availability of matzoth for Soviet Jews. Since this question, however, concerns Soviet domestic policies there does not appear to be any useful action which the Department could take to remedy this situation. The Department hopes that the Soviet Government will see fit to change its policies toward the baking of matzoth in answer to the many pleas which it is receiving on this question.

If the Department can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

STRATEGY OF SILENCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the primary functions of a Federal agency or department is the dissemination of information to the public. I wonder how many are aware of the Department of Agriculture's strategy of silence with regard to the operation of the proposed wheat certificate program. Unless the Department abandons its present policy, it will be responsible for untold financial disaster to those who have contracted to buy wheat and wheat products with delivery after July 1.

Yesterday I was contacted by the Gioia Macaroni Co., Inc., of Buffalo, N.Y., which has authorized the use of its name. It will be disastrous to this company and others similarly situated if the certificate plan is applicable to wheat already under contract. This company is obligated to purchase 200,000 bags of flour at \$6.31

per hundredweight which will be processed from 516,000 bushels of 1963 wheat already in the possession of its millers. If the 70-cent wheat certificate is imposed on this wheat the company has been advised by its miller that the price of flour will be increased from \$6.31 to \$7.91. Is this the effect of a wheat bill we were told repeatedly would not increase the price of wheat to the user?

Millers who purchased 1963 Durum No. 1 for future milling and those who have contracted to buy 1964 Durum No. 1 at \$2.38 a bushel will end up paying \$3.08 a bushel if the certificate is required. If the farm bill of 1964 is passed by the House of Representatives, those who purchase after July 1 will pay \$1.30 a bushel plus 70 cents for a certificate, plus 25 cents as a premium for Durum No. 1, plus transportation costs of approximately 34 cents, or a total of \$2.59. This imposes an initial inequity of 49 cents a bushel. Since it takes 2.58 bushels of wheat for each bag of flour, those now under contract will have to pay \$1.26 more than those who buy in the future. This disparity is enough to destroy many users of this one type of wheat who have purchased for future delivery.

The company in question can avoid financial ruin by canceling its contracts right now, at a loss of \$50,000. The decision to cancel is dependent upon knowing whether they will have to pay for wheat certificates on their flour. If they wait until later, they will lose over \$200,000, and will be wiped out. But the Department of Agriculture stated only yesterday afternoon that it will not announce its operating procedures for wheat certificates on forward delivery contracts until the farm bill of 1964 has cleared both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. President, this strategy of silence is a disastrous policy, and is one which the Senator from New York cannot condone. Does this Department have no responsibility for the possible financial ruin to the exporters and millers who have 1963 wheat in supply for post July delivery and those who have already obligated themselves to buy 1964 wheat which may now have the price of certificates added thereto? Some adjustment could be made by all, if the Department of Agriculture would make its policy clear at this time. Unless the Department does so, the House of Representatives is compelled to vote upon a bill without adequate knowledge of its effect. Before the House votes on the bill, the Department of Agriculture should issue a statement in regard to what it intends.

Personally, I opposed the wheat legislation because it was not in the interest of the farmers—I believed it was not in the interest of any farmers, and certainly not in the interest of the New York State farmers or the consumers. Already my concern that the price of wheat would be increased is being confirmed by the refusal of the Department of Agriculture to state whether contract wheat will have to bear certificates. If certificates are required, that can mean the destruction of many companies in

New York State and elsewhere and the loss of jobs.

I fervently hope the Secretary of Agriculture will speak out on this matter. If he refuses to do so, the only remedy is for the other body to provide in the bill itself that no certificates will be required on 1963 and 1964 wheat covered by existing contracts.

GEORGE SKOURAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with profound regret that I learned of the death of George Skouras, a pioneer in the development of the motion picture industry.

George Skouras' life is characterized by achievement, dedication, and imagination. The son of a poor Greek shepherd, he, along with his two brothers, came to the United States, and decided to seek his fortune in the motion-picture industry—an industry which at that time was one of little stability and uncertain reward. But with the courage and determination that George Skouras demonstrated all his life, he rose to become chairman of the board of United Artists, and president of Magna Pictures Corp. A distinguished New Yorker, a colorful personality, a fine businessman, and a warm friend, George Skouras devoted his magnificent talents to many worthy public causes; and he will be sorely missed by all of us who knew him.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow, his two daughters, and his brother, in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas very much for allowing me to speak at this time.

Mr. TOWER. I have been glad to yield.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MANSFIELD that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me, with the understanding that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. TOWER. Yes, with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Earlier today, I spoke on the floor of the Senate, and stated the reasons why I believe the civil rights bill should be referred for 10 days to the Judiciary Committee.

I pointed out, in essence, that I think it is of great importance that there be a committee report on the bill, for such a report can subsequently be used in litigation in the courts, in connection with a showing of the legislative intent in connection with the passage of the bill. I pointed out that after the bill was thus referred to the Judiciary Committee, and after 10 days of committee hearings and committee consideration had been had, and, of course, it is realized that I intend to make my motion after the Senate has taken up the bill, at which time my motion would be in order—thereafter, by means of the committee report on the bill, it would be possible to show the congressional intent in connection with the passage of the bill; and the showing of the congressional intent would be of very great importance in connection with court decisions.

It seems that sitting in the Senate gallery at the time I made my speech this afternoon was Clarence Mitchell, chairman and director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP. He has sent me a telegram; and I think it is due him that the telegram be placed in the RECORD. I am sure the references in the telegram to Senators will not be objected to by them; and certainly it is due me to make the reply which I shall now make to Mr. Mitchell's telegram, because of what he has stated in the telegram he intends to do with it.

I also wish to state to Senators that, in my opinion, such a demonstration of emotionalism and such an attack by Mr. Mitchell in sending me this telegram, prove, in my judgment, how important it is that the bill be before the committee for 10 days, so that a committee record can be made in regard to it and there can be a committee report on it.

I repeat that a majority of the members of the Judiciary Committee favor the bill, or at least favor a strong bill; and, being a majority, nothing in the world could prevent those nine members of the committee from filing a committee report with the Senate. The filing of that committee report is inevitable, if the nine members of the Judiciary Committee wish to file a report on the bill; and I point out that they have a clear obligation to file a report on it, for that is one major reason why I am urging that the bill be referred to the committee—so the Senate can receive the committee's report on the bill, and so there can be, as a result, clarification of any ambiguities which may be found to exist in connection with the bill, and so there can be a presentation of any amendments which the members of the committee feel should be offered to the bill.

Mr. Clarence Mitchell has sent me the following telegram:

Being unable to speak on the floor of the Senate, I have chosen this method to reply to your statement today about referring the civil rights bill to the Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee. I shall read this telegram at the Civil Liberties Clearing House Conference where I am speaking today.

I hope he will also have an extraordinary meeting of that conference called, and will read to it the speech I shall subsequently make on the floor of the Senate when I state the reasons why I believe that, as a matter of sound legislative practice, the bill should be referred to the committee.

I continue to read the telegram:

If there is any one thing that strains the faith of citizens, it is the persistent effort to give an aura of respectability to committee hearings on civil rights run by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND of Mississippi. To the man in the street this is the equivalent of the stacked deck, the hanging judge, and the executioner who enjoys his work. Every Member of the Senate who takes the trouble to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the day that Senator EASTLAND was named chairman of the Judiciary Committee knows that he was committed to a program of keeping civil rights bills in his hip pocket. Through the years as the civil problems have become more acute, he met them by getting a bigger pocket and a larger supply of pigeonholes.

There are very few Judiciary hearings on civil rights that I have not observed personally. These hearings are as remote from orderly process as the outermost corner of space is from Main Street in Topeka, Kans. Most questions are really one thousand word speeches. Most of the time is spent with Senator SAM ERVIN telling jokes about Uncle Remus, Brer Rabbit or some other king of folklore. It is this type of mauling of civil rights issues that has forced thousands of colored citizens to turn to the sidewalks and the picket line to get redress by direct confrontation.

It is shocking and depressing to one who considers himself a man of compassion and good will to hear the suggestion made that referral of this bill to the Judiciary Committee would make possible the consideration of legislation affecting coffee. Surely our country should not ask its colored citizens to stand aside for international coffee problems when they are being arrested, beaten, and bitten by dogs simply because they seek to purchase this beverage at public lunch counters. Surely our Latin American friends would be unfaithful to their own aspirations, if they would be willing to gain an advantage for coffee at the expense of human freedom in the United States.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,

Director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

Mr. President, I am in complete sympathy with Mr. Mitchell's desire to have civil rights legislation enacted; but I am in complete disagreement with him if he thinks that following the tactics set forth in that telegram, is the way to best serve the interests of the Negroes of America, irrespective of the fact that he may be director of the Washington Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People.

Neither Mr. Clarence Mitchell nor any other Negro leader serves a civil rights issue well by resorting to such tactics as are employed in the telegram. In the Senate we have a duty to follow procedure which in our judgment will best serve the passage of a sound civil rights bill and will lay a foundation for a law that will stand the test of the courts. I wish Mr. Clarence Mitchell to know that he can read any telegram that he desires to send to me, no matter what